| 1 | WRIGHT, FINLAY & ZAK, LLP | |
|----|--|--|
| | Robert Riether Esq. Nevada Bar No. 12076 | |
| 2 | 7785 W. Sahara Ave., Suite 200 | |
| 3 | Las Vegas, NV 89117 | |
| 4 | (702) 475-7964; Fax: (702) 946-1345 | |
| 5 | rriether@wrightlegal.net Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant, Wilmington Savings Fund Society, FSB, as Trustee | |
| | for Stanwich Mortgage Loan Trust A | |
| 6 | VALUE OF A TIPE OF | VOTED CO VED TO |
| 7 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA | |
| 8 | DISTRICT O | TIL VILOIT |
| 9 | WILMINGTON SAVINGS FUND SOCIETY, | Case No.: 2:17-cv-01775-JCM-BNW |
| | FSB, AS TRUSTEE FOR STANWICH MORTGAGE LOAN TRUST A, | |
| 10 | MORIGAGE LOAN IROSI A, | STIPULATION AND ORDER TO SET |
| 11 | Plaintiff, | BENCH TRIAL DATE |
| 12 | VS. | |
| 13 | SATICOY BAY LLC SERIES 9338 | |
| | WILDERNESS GLEN AVENUE; | |
| 14 | YELLOWSTONE HOMEOWNERS | |
| 15 | ASSOCIATION, | |
| 16 | Defendants. | |
| 17 | | _ |
| | SATICOY BAY LLC SERIES 9338 | |
| 18 | WILDERNESS GLEN AVENUE, | |
| 19 | Counterclaimant, | |
| 20 | VS. | |
| | | |
| 21 | WILMINGTON SAVINGS FUND SOCIETY, FSB, AS TRUSTEE FOR STANWICH | |
| 22 | MORTGAGE LOAN TRUST A, | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | Counter-Defendant. | |
| | | J |
| 25 | Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant, Edward B | rown ("Brown"), as substituted party fo |
| 26 | Wilmington Covings Fund Cociety ECD as T | ruotaa far Stanyviah Martagaa Laan Troot A |
| 27 | Wilmington Savings Fund Society, FSB, as Ti | tustee for Stanwich Mortgage Loan Trust A |
| 28 | ("Wilmington"), and Defendant/Counterclaimant Saticoy Bay LLC Series 9338 Wilderness Gle | |
| | | |
| | | |

Avenue ("Saticoy") (collectively, the "Parties"), by and through their counsel of record, by and through their respective attorneys of records, hereby agree and stipulate as follows.

- 1. The sole narrow remaining issue at this stage of the case is the issue of "prejudice" as explained in *U.S. Bank, Nat'l Ass'n ND v. Res. Grp., LLC*, 444 P.3d 442, 446 (Nev. 2019) ("*Resources Group"*) as well as the Ninth Circuit's November 17, 2021 order of reversal in this matter regarding the "notice/prejudice rule" applicable to foreclosure sales (the "Ninth Circuit Order"). (ECF No. 95).
- 2. On December 29, 2021, this Court issued its order (the "Supplement Order"), ordering that Brown supplement its briefing to address the limited issue of prejudice as it relates to the notice/prejudice issue. (ECF No. 99). On February 16, 2022, Brown submitted its supplement (the "Brown Supplement"). (ECF No. 106). On March 4, 2022, Saticoy Bay filed its respective supplemental opposition (the "Saticoy Bay Supplemental Opposition"). (ECF No. 111).
- 3. On April 15, 2022, this Court issued its order denying summary judgment (the "Post-Remand Order"), holding "there remains a genuine issue of material fact as to whether [Brown] suffered prejudice as a result of Saticoy's failure to provide notice". (ECF No. 112 at 3:6-8). The Court further ordered the parties engage in a settlement conference before Magistrate Judge Brenda Weksler where the case did not resolve. *Id.* at 3:15-16.
- 4. In the Ninth Circuit Order, the Ninth Circuit remanded "to allow the district court to evaluate in the first instance whether Wilmington has made a sufficient showing of prejudice." (ECF No. 95 at 3 and ECF No. 112 at 1:20-22). Subsequently, in the Post-Remand Order, this Court made clear that it "ordered [Brown] to supplement its motion for summary judgment as to the issue of whether it suffered prejudice..." (ECF No. 112 at 1:23-24). In denying Brown summary judgment post-remand, this Court continued, holding "there remains a genuine issue of material fact as to whether

ORDER Based on the aforementioned stipulation, this matter is set for a one day bench trial on March 27, 2023, at 9:00 a.m. Calendar call is set for March 22, 2023, at 1:30 p.m. IT IS SO ORDERED August 25, 2022. Cerus C. Mahan UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE